REMARKS

The claims have been amended better to point out that which applicants regard as their invention. The features of clam 2 now appear in claim 1. Thus, the claims before the Examiner are claims 1 and 3 to 8.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging receipt of the priority document and for listing references provided with an Information Disclosure Statement. The captioned application is a national stage filing of a PCT application. The examiner is asked to confirm that a copy of the certified copy of the priority document was received from the International Bureau.

A revised Abstract and a new title have been provided as required.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to specify the nature of the electrodes and the substrates. The first electrode is now described as a scan electrode; other elements likewise are described based upon the description in the specification. The claims also specify that a dielectric layer is formed on the back substrate in the second discharge space, a priming electrode is disposed on the dielectric layer in such a manner as to be parallel with the scan electrode and the sustain

electrode, and a priming discharge cell for performing a discharge with the scan electrode and the priming electrode is formed in the second discharge space. The advantage of such an arrangement is discussed below.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 to 7 provisionally under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 and 2 of application no. 10/505,007 to Takibana et al. (the '524 publication) in view of Makino '580 is respectfully traversed.

The instantly-claimed plasma display panel is configured to have a dielectric layer formed on the back substrate in the second discharge space, a priming electrode disposed on the dielectric layer in a manner to be parallel with the scan electrode and the sustain electrode, and a priming discharge cell for performing a discharge with the scan electrode. The priming electrode is formed in the second discharge space (meaning that the dielectric is not present on the priming electrode), and the priming discharge is generated by applying a positive pulse voltage when a scanning pulse is applied between the scan electrode (or the sustain electrode) and the priming electrode. As a result of such a configuration, even when the

plasma display panel possesses high definition, one is able to generate priming discharge readily and stably, making it possible to stabilize the address characteristics and at the same time making it possible freely to set the material physical values of the dielectric layer and the size values.

Tachibana et al. describes stabilizing the address characteristics of a plasma display panel by configuring same so that a data electrode is covered with a dielectric. A priming electrode in a region that corresponds to a second discharge space (a priming cell) is formed with a small layer thickness continuously with a dielectric layer that covers the data electrode. The reference thus shows and claims a device in which all of the data electrode and the priming electrode are covered with the dielectric layer. This structure differs significantly from what is called for in the amended claims.

Makino '580 discloses, for the purpose of obtaining an AC discharge-type plasma display panel with a high contrast ratio, a display sub-electrode that controls a discharge of the display panel (first discharge space) and a plasma display panel that is independently formed on the display cell electrode and is independently driven and controlled to permit a primary

discharge cell (priming cell) to generate a discharge. The plasma display panel has the data electrode covered with the dielectric and the priming electrode in the region corresponding to the second discharge space (priming cell) is also covered with the dielectric layer. Thus, the reference as the primary reference discloses a configuration in which the data electrode and the priming electrode are covered with a dielectric layer. The references in combination thus do not teach or suggest the invention claimed here.

Applicants particularly traverse the rejection of the method claims, for, as the Examiner acknowledges, neither claim 1 nor claim 2 of the primary reference is directed to methods. It is believed that all claims patentably define thereover.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 to 7 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of application no. 10/505,077 to Tachibana et al. based upon publication '807 in view of Makino '580 is also respectfully traversed for the same reasons given above. The rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 to 8 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 as indefinite is acknowledged. The Examiner had

questioned the language "the fourth electrode is formed on a dielectric layer and is disposed closer to the first electrode and the second electrode than the third electrode." That langage no longer appears in the amended claims, which recite the various relationships among and between the electrodes and the substrates. If after considering the instant amendment, the Examiner believes other language is more appropriate, he is asked to contact the undersigned.

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 103 as anticipated by Makino '580, if applied to claim 1 as amended, is respectfully traversed. As pointed out above, Makino '580 describes a plasma display panel in which the data electrode and the priming electrode are covered with a dielectric layer. The instant claims are not taught or suggested by the reference.

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Makino '580 in view of Ohtani et al. '238 is also respectfully traversed. Claim 3 depends upon claim 1 and is patentable thereover for the same reasons given above traversing the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 102 over Makino '580. The secondary reference is cited to show a particular longitudinal rib and lateral rib configuration. The reference,

like the others discussed above, shows a plasma display panel so configured that the electrodes that allow the second region to discharge are covered with the dielectric. That is not the configuration claimed here. The claim is patentable.

The rejection of claims 4 to 8 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Makino '480 is also respectfully traversed. The claims patentably define over the art because the structures of the device differ and a person of ordinary skill in the art is in no proper fashion directed to the invention claimed herein.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted their claims 1 and 3 to 8 are in condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

December 14, 2005
Date

Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-6415

New Attorney Docket No. 28951.2175
Old Attorney Docket No. MEIC:175

CAW/cd